PH, re Guinn's expect HSCA testimony and report HW 5/26/79

First I read the testimony, then the report, not continuously and not under good conditions, as I'll explain, But I write because it presents serious integrity problems to me. Among these are what I would prefer to believe is a departure fro pure science and expertise rather than accepted standards.

Not that the practise, real world does not provide adequate commentary on current standards of scientific responsibility, from Skylab to 3-Mile Island.

I made no effort to puzzle out all the technical stuff or the relevant symbols. And I admit to a possibly flawed memory, I'm not able to search files right now and may not be able to use some files for a while. I did try to read it criticially, not to see how much I could agree with it.

There is some localized venous damage to my right upper arm in reaction to the injection of a radio-active dye for necessary X-raying. Aside from the medication I was on, which is incompatible with almost everything else, no medication is possible. Treatment consists of helping the body do the job with warm, moist packs 3-4 times a day. When I read Guinn.

There is nowhere any accreditation of his base, the samples Nichols gave him. He has arrogant, egocentric, self-conceived superintellect but actually intellectual crook Nichols' word, and on not even that does he rely for his base because he just ignores what I think is a major problem. He has enormous variations within what he calls a single box of a mo. Did Nichols give him boxes? If so, as obtained from Western? As off the line? Repacked? Or, how can he validate the samples for the based that he does not trouble himself to validate?

He drills his own specimens od core and fotnotes may be contaminated them with jacket material? Can't he do better? Something wrong with the center of the core for so fine a drilling?

Same with his JFK specimens. He blandly says they do not match their official descriptions so he tests them anyway and gives them meaning without establishing their origin. Why did he not insist on having the identical specimens? If NAA is not destructive then the FBI still has them or there is another can of worms. And on those materials NAA is not destructive.

Gallagher did the NAA in Q15. Gallagher did the spectro on NAA. If Gallagher consumed the entire sample on spectro Gallagher would have known it and not subjected what remained to non-destructive NAA.

If it is argued that there were no jacket testings because there were no jacket fragments recovered from JFK or Connally, then it necessarily is argued that the sole purpose of the test was to undertake to confirm the official solution. It was still essential to identify the two specimens of jacket recovered in the limo and they also should have been compared with Q1 and Q8. Guinn is one of the pioneers in establishing the greater dependability of jacket material in identifications, funded by NJ. So he ignores the jacket tests. Even if HSCA asked this as a scientist he should have refused.

So I have troubles with the whole business, beginning with basic integrity.

If you get a chance to give the testimony and report a critical reading I'd be interested in knowing if your physics can provide any evaluations.

Sincerely,